

New Republic

Success in Europe

What the Lisbon Conference Achieved

Danger in Asia

India Faces Dictatorship or Revolution

McCarran's Iron Curtain

Visitors and Immigrants—Not Welcome!

Feb 21

Letters

Adlai Stevenson

● Illinois committee for Stevenson highly commends excellent Stevenson story in February 14 issue. The *New Republic* has done its usual masterful job in presenting facts to its readers.

GEORGE OVERTON

WALTER JOHNSON

Co-Chairmen, Illinois Committee
Stevenson for President
Chicago, Ill.

Prosperity on the Farm

● It took considerable effort during the long agricultural depression of the 1920's and 1930's to convince urban newspapers and periodicals that rural conditions were as serious as they were.

There is some danger that changed conditions may not be recognized. The facts stated in column one, page 14 of your issue of January 14 are correct as far as they go. They fail to take into account such facts as these:

1. While the 1950 agricultural census reported 5,379,043 farmers, only 4,523,000 persons gave their occupation as farmer in answer to census questions on the labor force.

2. More than one-fourth of all farmers, outside five Midwest states almost one-third, reported to the census that in 1949 they received more income from non-agricultural sources than from the sale of their farm products.

3. Senator Sparkman's committee shows that this non-farm income amounted to more than one-third of the cash income of all farms after production costs were deducted. It also showed that on average the lower the farm income, the higher the average non-farm income. In the two lowest categories of farm income non-farm income averaged almost \$2,000 per family.

The problem of the value of farm products produced by the farm family, and whether to value at prices on the farm or at retail in town, also enters in here when one wants to compare rural and urban.

All this is not to say that poverty and under-employment have been eliminated in rural America. It is to say that partly because of the very broad census definition of what a farm is and partly because of the increasing inter-relatedness of the agricultural and non-agricultural sectors of the economy, generalizations on the basis of national figures can give a somewhat skewed picture.

EDMUND des BRUNNER

Teachers College, Columbia
University, New York City

What Happened in China

● I object violently to the statement of Gen. Thomas Phillips (*NR*, Jan. 21) that "Communist victory [in China] was made possible by the eight years Chiang fought Japan."

It would be absurd to claim that the Kuomintang failure was a result of the exhaustive zeal with which they conducted the Japanese war. Remember that Chiang had to be kidnapped before he would yield to the popular demand for a war against the invading Japanese. Remember, too, that after a few successful years of this United Front, Kuomintang co-operation diminished drastically, often to the point of collaborating with the invaders. Meanwhile the Communists were busy collecting popular support by continuing the war much more seriously. This was hardly subversion. Indeed it might be more correct to say that "Communist victory was made possible by the eight years the Communists fought Japan."

Yet if anything at all is to be believed of the military reports on which US policy was based, Chiang had in 1945 an overwhelming military force and could easily have finished the job he had started 10 years before of exterminating the Communists. But the Civil War suddenly turned into a People's War and the victories never came off. Because of propaganda? Undoubtedly, but then, what propagandist could lose when provided with material such as the rent and interest-rate increases in Nationalist areas, or the corruption in Chiang's government and army? Perhaps Communist victory was made possible by the many years Chiang fought China.

But Chiang's political and military suicide was incorporated into US policy. Chiang's stubborn refusal to meet the obvious demands of his people was mimicked by US refusal to see his failure. Although we are quite willing now to do business in Yugoslavia with ex-Stalinists, we utterly refused in China to consider dealing with those who, apparently, were not yet Stalinists. Perhaps this is where the aggressive diplomacy was needed.

Chapel Hill, N. C.

DICK HARTUNG

The Plight of the Aged

● When you advocate, in your issue of January 14, imposing a "20-percent withholding tax on dividends, interest and royalties, such as now applies to wages and salaries," you overlook the fact that many elderly men and women have as their sole support their incomes from dividends, amounting in many cases to less than \$5,000 per year. Under the present system, there is besides the personal exemption, a second exemption for old age, and a third for blindness. There

are also allowable deductions for state taxes, medical care, church and charities.

According to your suggestion, an individual of 70 with an income of \$3,600 per year from dividends only would have to pay \$720 of their sources to the federal government. If the person lived in Ohio, there would be a state tax of \$80 on these same dividends. There would be no exemptions, no deductions.

I suppose these exemptions and deductions constitute some of the "most vicious loopholes" you mention; my conclusion is that if your method of relieving the "lower-income groups" is adopted, this particular low-income family of two, both over 70 and one three-fourths blind, will be changing its habits of living, even though its modest income from dividends is supplemented by an even smaller "retirement salary" from Ohio State University.

Winter Park, Fla.

O. N. M.

Toynbee on Russia

● Arnold Toynbee (*NR*, Dec. 31) seeks in the framework of historic precedents the answer to the question: "Can we live in peace?" Failing that, Mr. Toynbee falls back on "the unwritten condition on

(Continued on page 4)

Bandwagon

Threat of Peace

The Western powers mapped today a counter-drive against a Russian proposal for a special UN Security Council meeting to consider the Korean armistice and other world dangers. — *AP dispatch from Paris.*

Clear Case

At Wheeling, W. Va., Sen. McCarthy told a Republican women's club that secret and previously undisclosed Congressional testimony by an unidentified witness showed Mr. [Leon H.] Keyserling had once talked with a Communist Party organizer. — *From the New York Herald Tribune.*

Honest Max

Max Baer . . . will be among speakers during the Sacramento Lincoln Day dinner. . . . Baer, of Sacramento, was born in a two-room cabin near Omaha, Neb., and rose to become one of the nation's foremost boxers. He is expected to relate similarities between his life and that of Lincoln. — *From the Sacramento, Calif., Union.*

Our readers are invited to contribute; \$2 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, c/o New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. — The Editors.

CONTENTS FOR MARCH 3, 1952

- 5 Lisbon's Brave Start
An Editorial
- 6 Asia—The New Threat
An Editorial
- 7 The Week:
- 7 Pass the Crying Towel
- 8 Oil for Schools
- 8 Salt Water into Fresh
- 9 Outside America
- 10 Rating the Senators, by Byron L. Johnson and W. E. Butt
- 12 McCarran's Iron Curtain
 - I. Visitors: Not Welcome, by Edward A. Harris
 - II. Immigrants: Still Fewer Wanted, by Fowler Harper
- 15 Danger of Dictatorship in India, by M. N. Roy
- 17 A Letter from Israel
- 18 Books:
- 18 The Continuing Pursuit of Herman Melville, by Katherine Hoskins
- 19 Unhappy Parallel, by David B. Truman
- 19 Handbooks for Crisis, by Alexander Klein
- 20 Quest for Genius, by Rolf Fjelde
- 21 Fiction Parade
- 22 On the Air
- 22 Theatre

EDITOR: Michael Straight

EDITORIAL DIRECTOR: Bruce Bliven

PUBLISHER: Daniel Mebane

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: Helen Fuller

ASSISTANT EDITOR: Elizabeth Huling

REPORTERS: Jean Begeman, Arnold J. Heidenheimer

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Malcolm Cowley, John Farrelly, Joseph P. Lash, Max Lerner, James R. Newman, Gus Tyler.

DEPARTMENTS: Robert Hatch (Chief), Cecil Smith (Music), Saul Carson (Radio and Television), Harold Clurman (Theatre), Lincoln Kirstein (Fine Arts)

COPY ASSISTANT: Lucille Davis

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1952, IN THE U. S. A. BY WESTBURY PUBLICATIONS, INC., PUBLISHING OFFICE 301 N. ST., N. E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C. EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS COMMUNICATIONS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y. ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER SEPTEMBER 26, 1950, AT THE POST OFFICE AT WASHINGTON, D. C., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879. SINGLE COPY, 20c; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, \$6.50; CANADA AND FOREIGN, \$7.50. PRINTED IN THE U. S. A.

WASHINGTON WIRE

FAILURE of Ike to return to America in April will leave his supporters out on a limb. The theory of the original Eisenhower strategy was to avoid the mud-slinging of a primary campaign, divide preliminary delegations about equally with Taft, then make a triumphal return just before the GOP convention and sweep the nomination into his lap. It isn't going like that: Taft is getting too many delegates. Gen. Lucius D. Clay saw Ike in London at the King's funeral, urged him to return to testify at Mutual Security Aid hearings or before Columbia University's "American Assembly." This official appearance would be in uniform, with talk limited to foreign affairs. But this wouldn't suit the Dewey-Lodge-Duff-Carlson groups of Ike backers. They are alarmed. The success of the Lisbon conference opens the way for Ike to quit NATO they insist; they want Ike to doff his uniform, come back and campaign.



Taft's outline of his foreign affairs views may make it easier to get Ike back. They are everything Ike opposes. For the historical student, Taft's role is wonderfully apt in the great Western struggle between internationalism and nationalism. At Lisbon and similar parleys, the internationalists are Acheson, Eden, Schuman and Adenauer. But each is plagued by a nationalist heel-dragger at home: Taft, Bevan, de Gaulle, Socialist Schumacher in Germany. The first group is pushing into the future. The second group is holding back, for reasons that range from mistaken idealism to sheer chauvinism. When the House unexpectedly defied its leadership last week and voted 189 to 143, demanding to know whether Truman had entered secret agreements with Churchill about sending US troops over seas, it gave a peep at powerful forces. As it happened this particular issue quickly evaporated. But fears of just

such actions as this bedevil Washington, London, Paris, Bonn. In Congress they throw sand in the gears of allied co-operation. "Nationalist" Congressmen can't abide the "humiliation" of wooing delicately balanced neutral states. As Taft boldly puts it, why should we help them fight Communism if they won't help themselves?

Note the result: Congress passed a reasonably good Mutual Security Act last fall. Then it affixed unnecessary and stupidly oratorical conditions to the act over the State Department's vain protest. A bewildered Congress now notes that Indonesia, Mexico and four other nations have rejected the terms. Weak, shaky, super-sensitive Indonesia desperately needs US economic-military aid, but the pro-allied government there has just fallen in a vote turning on the conditions lightly written by obtuse US Congress last fall. It is against the folly of these conditions that Ike might well testify when the acts renewal comes up this Spring.

Seven weeks of the present Congress have produced only two important acts, the admission of Greece and Turkey to the NATO and the lifting of zinc and lead tariff curbs. Bored reporters call this the "Molasses Congress" in reference to its pace. At the present rate, it won't enact money bills by summer, and Congress may only recess during the conventions. All big bills, on the St. Lawrence Waterway, Alaska statehood, taxation and the like, will probably be shelved. Key to the demoralizing spectacle is, of course, the basic split between a "Fair Deal" White House and an old-guard Congress. Voters made one liberal, the other conservative in the 1948 election, and a deadlock under our system of divided powers has continued since.

Somebody has asked us, in all seriousness, what we think of Sen. Bob Kerr (D, Okla.) for President. Well, let's say it and then forget it. Kerr is a big,

booming, bustling Baptist who won Truman's undying gratitude by taking on MacArthur, almost alone, in the Congressional investigations. He did a swell job. He is quick-witted, afraid of nobody and has a good foreign-affairs record. And that's about all. He is an oil millionaire, entirely surrounded by Ed Pauley and Louis Johnson. He favors the off-shore oil grab. He has worked against federal controls. The celebrated "Kerr Amendment" to the natural-gas control bill would have exempted from federal price regulation natural gas sold in pipelines. It would have made rich Mr. Kerr richer. Truman vetoed it. Truman seems willing to forgive this dereliction but others can't. Dixiecrats would love Kerr.

Prediction for February, 1956: Look for much discussion in US newspapers of the "undemocratic" system of letting bosses select Presidential candidates; this will be accompanied by proposals to "reform" America's archaic primary system, which will be forgotten when conventions start. Similar predictions for 1960, 1964, 1968, et seq.

Subversive front: Sacrosanct Communist apostate and witch-detector, Louis Budenz, several times testified he knew career diplomat John Carter Vincent was a member of the Communist Party. The State Department has now kicked Budenz in the pants by "clearing" Vincent.

Notes: The Army has cut retired General MacArthur's personal Army staff from eight to three men; another insult for Taft to redress as President . . . MacArthur now has only a colonel, a warrant officer and a sergeant to look after his simple wants. . . . Rep. Monroe Redden (D, N.C.) and brother each got \$25,000 for negotiating a client's RFC loan; everyone in Washington knows Congress will investigate Congressmen only as the last resort. . . . The American Legion's ex-hero, Westbrook Pegler, is now blasted by the Legion's National Americanism Commission; it seems his attacks on CIO and AFL officials' work against Reds in Europe was too much even for Legion.

Washington

T.R.B.

CORRESPONDENCE

(Continued from page 2)

which we and the Russians are going to co-exist, so that each party shall go on serving as the other party's devil."

Neither answer is affirmative, dynamic, constructive, evolutionary.

The concept of long-range cultural evolution, and the cultural instrument, based on a 20th century conceptual scheme of Jeffersonian democracy, implementing the cosmic long-range cultural evolution, offers an affirmative answer to the question: "Can we live in peace?"

In terms of long-range cultural evolution, both, Russia and America, are unconsciously in search of the laws, mechanics and instrumentalities of cultural progress, and a *modus vivendi* adjusted to the technologic era we enter into.

Americanism is based on the premises that the realistic approach to cultural progress is through individual integrity; Communism is based on the premise that the realistic approach to cultural progress is through social integrity.

Speaking in terms of long-range cultural evolution, both are approaching—from opposite directions—a balance between individual integrity and social integrity, corresponding to the cosmic law of balance of centrifugalism and centripetalism, respectively.

St. Louis, Mo.

PHILIP WEISS

India and the US

● I feel very happy about Shridharani's article (NR, Nov. 26) on the popular, understanding and friendly American Ambassador, Chester Bowles, in India. It appears to me that the American ambassador in India may win headlines and also heartlines in the hearts of the kindly people of India for whose advancement he displays such keenness and who stresses mutual respect between India and the US.

Bombay, India

BHAGIRATH WEHTA

The 1952 Campaign

● The discussion in your columns of available, desirable and fit candidates for the Presidential nomination by the Democrats appears to have shown that the most logical man is Associate Justice William O. Douglas of the US Supreme Court. Why should not liberal and progressive Democrats, as well as independents who normally vote the Democratic ticket, recognize that patent fact and act accordingly—that is, organize nationally to promote the Douglas candidacy? What is wrong with that simple proposal? What sound ethical principle would such a move violate? None, in the last analysis.

The . . . pseudo-conservatives talk and write about judicial dignity and freedom from entangling partisan or other political alliances. Such talk is shallow if not

hypocritical. The Justice need not make a single speech in his own behalf, nor write a single letter. Let us liberals do all the work that has to be done at this stage. That he would accept a nomination we have every right and reason to take for granted. He is educated, cultured, genuinely liberal and he has brains. We need brains in the White House. Mediocrity minus is dangerous in the extreme. The President now wields great power, and he can ignore Congress and by-pass the Constitution. Truman has done this, not with malicious or subversive intent, to be sure, but because he is ignorant and muddled. The Korean War is his war, as Taft charges. We have destroyed Korea by our blundering and foundering. The situation there is tragic. Impartial correspondents have left us in no doubt on that point. We want no nonentities in the Presidency. We want chief executives of known ability, judgment and integrity. In Justice Douglas we have that type of candidate. Why hesitate and play into the hands of reactionaries or small-bore politicians?

La Jolla, Calif.

VICTOR S. YARROS

Was Bevan Right?

● Your comments on national and international affairs are often pithy and to the point. It seems to me that in the case of Aneurin Bevan you have missed the boat, however. You attacked him because he pointed up the problem of rearmament versus the social welfare of the group at an inopportune time in our Atlantic alliance. But did his actions and statements disrupt the Labour Party beyond recall? Isn't Churchill admitting the truth of Bevan's thesis in his present trip to Washington?

Let's face it, Bevan did a good job in pointing out the problem and brought it into the open so that the voters of Britain could see just what he stood for and what the Labour Party should stand for. One can only wish that there were some of his political stripe in America who would be able to clearly state what they think and then have the honesty to pursue the policy. Instead we must choose between a Taft, Bridges, Rankin, Knowland, Connally, and a very few like Lehman, Douglas or Morse.

Cheshire, Mass.

DONALD FITZGERALD

A special eight-page reprint of the material on Gov. Adlai Stevenson's views on public affairs from the issue of Feb. 18 can be purchased on order from the *New Republic*, 1416 F Street N.W., Washington, D.C. The price of individual reprints is 10 cents. Discounts on quantity orders will be quoted on request.



LISBON'S BRAVE START

FOUR WEAK governments met under heavy pressure in London. In Lisbon they created an entity that is strong. Their success is a triumph for the validity of the concepts of European union and Western unity.

The debates which preceded this action, in Paris and Bonn were concerned with the terms of entry of Germany and France into the European union. The Bundestag sought naturally complete equality and erasure of the past. The French National Assembly wanted limits set to Germany's independence of action. Yet in neither debate were reservations pressed beyond hope of compromise and at London, compromise on most issues was achieved.

One issue was Germany's contribution to the combined defense effort. The French set expenditures equal to their own total effort; the Germans proposed an amount equivalent to occupation costs. The compromise, agreed to by Bonn, is close to the higher limit proposed by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization planners.

A second issue was the release of war criminals. To the allies it symbolizes Germany's repudiation of fascism; within Germany it shapes the role that Hitler's generals will play as Germany rearms. Again the compromise of joint responsibility in any reduction of sentences is all we had hoped to achieve.

A third issue concerned security safeguards. The French went far in conceding Germany's role in producing armaments. The Germans in turn accepted restrictions under a formula covering arms production in "exposed areas" that avoided stigmatization.

A fourth issue was Germany's membership in the NATO. By delegating authority over all the NATO forces to Eisenhower, and by creating a new consultative body, Germany is given the substance of the NATO membership without participation in general political decisions.

These compromises seem to us workable and fair.

For all these successes, the dangers are still great. The Paris and Bonn debates demonstrate that four main principles must guide the NATO from now on.

First, European union will advance only in company with Atlantic unity. That is true because the most dangerous aspect of European union—the European army—is coming into being in the absence of European political

institutions. For this reason Britain, Canada and the US are committed to the hardest possible assurances that Germany will not dominate Europe, or leave Europe in pursuit of new gains from the East. At Lisbon the NATO succeeded because the US promised to submit our military budget for review, as all others must, and because Britain agreed to be "a flying buttress supporting from outside" (as the *Economist* put it) if not "a pillar within." By joining in one dramatic declaration of common aims written by Anthony Eden, Britain, Canada and the US offer assurance that they are fully committed to Europe. From now on, any re-affirmation of isolationism in the US will wreck all we have won.

Second, the European army must be followed up swiftly by a constitutional convention, for armies, like children, need parents. Europe knows this. The heart of the Paris debate was the insistence by deputies from Socialists to de Gaullists that an armed force not responsible to a representative political body was a threat. The reason that Daniel Mayer led many Socialists to oppose the European Defense Community Plan was not rejection of military union, but insistence on political union.

Third, a campaign of political education is now the primary need. For many reasons, negotiations for the European federation until now have progressed in secrecy, shrouded by a sense of guilt. The worst example of this has been in Germany, where all citizens were kept wholly in the dark about progress toward European union until a few months ago. The nationalist and socialist opposition will make the most of this highhandedness. We may still pay heavily for failing to carry peoples along in all that governments are accomplishing.

Lastly, the key to success is generous US aid. The military goals set at Lisbon are high for a Europe still divided to meet. We may well find that a burden has been laid on the new union, heavier than it can bear. France faces a budgetary crisis that its government can hardly survive. Germany faces threatening elections next year. In each nation the dynamics of opposition will lead minority parties of all persuasions to make the most of all grievances and hardships. The mounting pressures of inflation can still carry away our paper divisions and blueprints unless the United States aid sustains Lisbon's brave start.

ASIA — THE NEW THREAT

GREAT EVENTS are occurring in the strengthening of the Atlantic nations. If they were the whole free world we could see at last a basis for hope.

But the truth is, of course, that Europe is one small sector in a world struggle, in which as one weak sector grows strong, the danger of aggression simply shifts to a new weak point.

That point is South Asia, where resistance to aggression or revolution is slowly crumbling. There the Russians hope to exhaust the West in a 30 years war. This war, if Soviet strategy is successful, will be fought, not against our enemies, the Communists, but against our friends, the Asian nationalists; it will be waged not between two hostile powers, America and Russia, but two potential allies, Asia and the West.

We have, as yet, no counter strategy to meet this growing threat. And into the empty spaces of our policy are marching the banner-bearers of the quasi-policy of "bomb and blockade." These men are wholly untrained to think of action in Asia except in military terms. They derive their prestige, and their attitudes, from the experience of Korea, and yet the lesson of Korea is that military action is no solution. With ground superiority, and complete domination of air, sea and heavy weapons, 48 nations, led by the US, have been unable to reach a military decision in Korea. If Communist agents can make all Asia the battleground, avoiding a single action large enough to send the B-36s over Moscow, they can operate a score of little wars, as suction pumps, to drain our strength.

Although a program of bomb and blockade is suicidal folly, there is no obvious alternative policy. One reason is that in contrast to the quick results held out by the advocates of military action, the gains of an economic program are unproductive in the short term. That is because the problems of Asia are not subject to quick remedies, and because, in advancing long-range solutions, the West starts at a disadvantage today.

One reason is that the West bears the burden of an intolerable heritage in Asia. The educated middle class, which is the decisive group in Asia, is dominated by a passionate rejection of Western domination. To this group Russia is the enemy of the Western imperialists and thereby a friend and ally.

In addition, the West bears the burden of intolerable practices of racial discrimination. Again Russia represents the ideal of racial equality and in truth, as Norman

Thomas once remarked, the Russians do treat all races alike, shooting men for their opinions whether they are white or colored.

Communism gains further because the police state is attractive to Asians. To conservatives, Asian society is traditionally hierarchic and authoritarian. To reformers dictatorship offers the short cut to the welfare state. To citizens disgusted with corrupt politicians, Communists, who forego the present enjoyments of wealth for the deferred satisfactions of power, appear as a superior type of leaders.

There is no obvious political alternative to the police state in Asia, given universal illiteracy and unendurable poverty. There is no obvious economic alternative to Communism in bringing about the longed for goal of industrialization. There is no fund of overseas capital ready to advance Asia, no adequate fund of savings on which local enterprise can draw, no modern entrepreneur class. Nor is there the civil service, and the tax-collection system which can permit democratic socialism to accomplish by voluntary methods, what Communist states achieve by force.

Given these disadvantages, we have hoped that the independence of the new Asian states was the great experience that would overcome the threat of enslavement to Russia. Today that seems too optimistic a view. Formosa, Burma, Tibet, Korea and Indo-China are all historically wards of imperial China. Malaya is beset by an ambitious Chinese minority. For all of these new nations, the issue is less independence or colonization, but dependence on a power that is nearby, and Asian, or on a power that is alien and far away.

All these factors lead men like Nehru to neutralism in the belief that since Communism will gain in Asia in peacetime, the West is likely to bring on the third world war. M. N. Roy, a far deeper thinker on the nature of Communism, believes that we are too weak to try to save all of free Asia, and that "centers of resistance should be built up where the enemy is still weak." It is his conclusion that India offers the best hope in all Asia that makes his appraisal of the outlook in India, published in this issue of the *New Republic*, so alarming.

We need a sound policy for Asia: it starts with realities. The first great reality is that we are weak.

To recognize our weakness helps us and does not hurt us. It compels us to shed the fantastic illusion that we

are able to impose our will on Asia, and that any failure to impose our will is a reflection not of our weakness, but of the treachery of some minor official of the State Department whose views are not those of McCarthy or the China Lobby.

Further, democracy shows its finest qualities when it fights against odds. It is then that peril serves as a summons to unselfish effort and survival calls forth militant and inspiring ideas. From the recognition of peril a dynamic policy starts.

To recognize that we are weak in Asia compels us also to realize that we will gain only where we go East to serve Asia, not to help Asia serve us. The subordination of the Point Four Program to our strategic requirements was a self-defeating gesture, based on a fatal overestimation of our strength in Asia and Asia's need for us. Where we intervene, it must be to carry out Asia's own designs.

To recognize that we are weak means further to understand that the Western nations cannot afford the luxury of independent action or even rivalry in Asia. It has become ridiculous, in the face of the peril we commonly face, for Britain, France and the US to join in Europe while in Asia each scorns the actions of the others as selfish imperialism and glorifies its own as unselfish martyrdom in a common cause.

The second great reality on which policy must be based,

is Asia's critical importance in our world struggle. That means raising action in Asia to the priority it deserves.

In some cases, a proper priority for Asia means a greater effort now. If this country is unwilling to add to our budget, then it should seriously consider whether we gain more by building three more bombers than by doubling our economic-aid program for Pakistan; the cost is the same. Ambassador Bowles tells us that without \$250 million in aid this year, the Indian Government cannot achieve its vital objectives. Is one new aircraft carrier worth more than that?

In other cases, a proper priority for Asia means no more money, but money better spent. It means organizing aid on a comprehensive national plan for each country; protecting the aid projects against the competition of other programs for scarce dollars and materials; placing the program on a long-range time schedule that makes sense, and carrying it out through a single, independent action agency as bold as the ECA was under Paul Hoffman.

The third reality on which Asian policy must be based is the fact that Communism's appeal to millions in Asia is expressive of their urgent demands for social change. Only when we base our policy on the recognition that reform is the alternative to revolution will we realize that Asia can be saved without the loss of resources we cannot afford and young men we must not lose.

THE WEEK

PASS THE CRYING TOWEL

A wild-swinging, though presumably unco-ordinated, campaign against the principle of the union shop has burst out all around the country. It's the same old battle-cry: "Freedom for the individual worker!"

The initial voice against the union shop was raised by former Minnesota Sen. Joseph H. Ball who has long felt that the Taft-Hartley Act was far too mild. In last month's issue of the *Freeman* magazine, the former St. Paul newspaper man who is now editing a labor-management relations letter for corporations, wrote that if the Wage Stabilization Board recommends a union shop for steelworkers it will be the final act in the making of "unwilling slaves" and would be horribly un-American.

Joe Ball, who still has not forgotten his one-sided beating at the hands of Hubert Humphrey in 1948, is now peddling thousands of reprints of the article, which has all the earmarks of initiating a new anti-union crusade.

After being fumbled about for some days, the ball was finally picked up by Donald R. Richberg, who in 1926 helped to write the Railway Labor Act as an attorney for the unions, and now represents a powerful collection of Southeastern railroads. He became quite exercised over a unanimous recommendation of a Presidential Emergency Board that all Class I railroads "should grant a union shop and check-off by national agreement."

Richberg termed the board's findings as "intolerable, impossible and bordering on the nonsensical." He knew what it

would mean to his wealthy rail clients if it should be granted. For the first time they would be faced with formidable unions across the bargaining tables. The million-odd shopcraft workers, formerly among the highest paid of skilled workers, have slid far down the scale, a fact attributed by many to the union shop restrictions.

Probably hoping to forestall union-shop approval by the WSB in both the steel and aircraft cases, the National Association of Manufacturers has climbed into the act. It sees a concerted drive to extend the union shop. "The stage for this pressure was set," the NAM said, "when the union strategists forced the Administration into giving the Wage Stabilization Board authority to act in disputes. They further cleared the way by getting Congress to repeal a

provision of the Taft-Hartley law which gave employees a voice in determining whether they should be subjected to the compulsion of a union shop."

Repeal of the provision, the NAM did not point out, was supported by some of the most conservative members of Congress when it was revealed that the union shop had won in all but an insignificant few of the elections conducted. The co-author of the act, Sen. Robert Taft himself, was co-author of the amendment.

All this has brought forth a strong retort from the International Association of Machinists. "The union shop," the IAM weekly newspaper *The Machinist* recently editorialized, "means that everyone in the shop has a voice and a vote in the affairs of the union. The union shop obligates every employee to join the union but it also guarantees every employee a say in the wages and conditions he or she works under. A man can't live in a community and refuse to pay his taxes. In the same way, a man or woman who works in a union shop has an obligation to the union. Just as government takes care of community affairs, so the union takes care of affairs in the shop or plant. The poisonous propaganda from the boys in the back room—Donald Richberg, Joe Ball and the other anti-labor specialists—would have us believe otherwise. They're weeping for us and collecting the weepers' rates for it. Will somebody pass the crying towel."

OIL FOR SCHOOLS

Public interest favoring the use of tideland-oil revenue for education has finally reached Capitol Hill. The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has received scores of letters (many resulting from the effective news broadcasts by AFL commentator Frank Edwards) urging Congress to solve the tideland-oil controversy by using the revenue from oil and natural gas leases in land off the Pacific and Gulf Coasts to meet the needs of our educational system.

The education amendment, introduced by Lister Hill (D, Ala.) and 10 other Senators, was defeated in the House

Judiciary Committee last year by a vote of 18 to 7; the Senate Interior Committee rejected the proposal by a vote of 7 to 4 last month. Hearings on the Hill Amendment, held after the Senate committee voted, revealed the support of 40 national organizations—a show of strength that may result in favorable action when the House-passed tidelands bill comes up for a vote in the Senate next week.

Rep. John Kennedy (D, Mass.) meanwhile has introduced a joint resolution which provides that the proceeds of the oil be earmarked by the federal government for health purposes. Kennedy points out that the shortage of medical facilities and health personnel is becoming increasingly acute. "The health of our people is the nation's most valuable asset," Kennedy believes. "Like any other asset, the national health requires an investment for its development and preservation. To what better use could the money from tidelands oil be put than to the health of the nation?"

Senator Hill's case for the oil-for-education bill is a strong one. According to the US Education Commission, 99,000 new teachers are needed to fill positions left vacant by retirement, resignation or death during 1951-52; expanded school enrollments call for at least 25,000 new classrooms; one out of every five schoolhouses now in use should be abandoned or extensively remodeled because they are fire hazards, obsolete or health risks. In 1930, we spent 3.1 percent of our national income for schools, including teachers' salaries. In 1951 this dropped to 2.5 percent.

SALT WATER INTO FRESH

A centuries-old dream of mankind, of turning salt water into fresh at a cost so low as to be economically practical, has apparently at last become a reality.

A new method for desalting seawater, developed by Dr. Walter Juda of Harvard Medical School and his associates, has just been announced. In parts of the world where electricity is produced at a low price, this method can give us fresh water in practically unlimited quantities at 10 to 20 cents per thousand

gallons. Heretofore the engineers had been hoping to develop a process that would produce fresh water at 50 cents per thousand, which was deemed low enough to be commercially feasible. In the arid Southwestern United States, fresh water obtained from natural sources sometimes costs up to 20 cents per thousand gallons.

Most previous attempts at large-scale desalting of seawater have been based upon distillation, heating the water until it turned into steam, leaving the salt behind; great hopes had been built upon the use of the waste heat manufactured in such vast quantities by atomic piles. The new process, on the contrary, is based upon "ion exchange."

It was long ago discovered that there are certain substances, of which salt is one, that do not conduct electricity while in dry form but will do so in a solution. This is because their molecules, which are normally neutral, electrically speaking, break up in solution into atoms, part of which are positively charged and part negatively. This fact is used to separate out the salt. In Dr. Juda's technique, membranes of inexpensive synthetic plastic, less than 40 thousandths of an inch thick, are employed, plus electric current; there are no moving parts, no artificial heat, and no chemicals except the natural salt. Two-thirds of the water comes out fresh; the other third has the salt and other chemicals, among them magnesium, which can be extracted for commercial purposes. The flow of water is continuous, and can be speeded up indefinitely by increasing the amount of electricity (which, however, increases the cost).

The importance of this development, if it lives up to its promise, can hardly be overstated.

Many parts of the United States that are near the ocean are running badly short of fresh water, due to reckless over-use and the unparalleled growth of population. All deserts throughout the world, if near the sea—as most of them are—may be completely transformed in the course of time, if they can get unlimited fresh water at a not prohibitive cost. What this may do to the future of the Middle East, for instance, is almost beyond imagination.

Outside America

CONTAINING THE CONTAINERS

Sooner than most Europeans had expected, the problem of "containing the containers" has come up as a practical issue of the military and political organization of Western Europe. The "containers" at this time and in the present context are of course the West Germans. And the problem has been posed by what the late Jules Cambon used to call *la gaffe allemande*—the German mistake.

There is a world of difference between Winston Churchill's denial that he had over-committed his government to American get-tough-with-China sentiment and Konrad Adenauer's denial that he made a statement amounting to putting a blackmail or at least a black-market price on his government's support of a Western European arms treaty. Churchill was telling the truth—at least the political truth. The obviously hypocritical retraction on Adenauer's part suggested disturbingly that Adolf Hitler's system of the big lie had become, temporarily, the technique of the little lie.

There has never been much doubt in Europe that, as soon as the West Germans were made big enough by the highly invigorating tonic of the need for them as arch-containers, they would make big demands. That, however, was of a relatively distant future. As Raymond Aron pointed out in the *Figaro* of Paris:

The guarantee against the resurgence of a new German militarism comes more from the Atlantic alliance than from a European institution. The Federal Republic will depend on American good will for many years. Diplomatic instruments will never have more than secondary value compared with factual dependences and solidarities.

It was also recognized, as Aron says, that Germany's predominant, if not exclusive, concern has been the remaking of its "unity" while France's has been its "security." For the Germans, Euro-

pean unity is the road to national unification—and not only of the two severed parts and the Saar. Kurt Schumacher said:

Without the idea of a re-conquest of the territories of Eastern Germany, occupied by the Soviets and their satellites, a rearmament of West Germany is morally impossible and psychologically unrealizable.

Members of Adenauer's cabinet—men like Thomas Dehler, Hans Christoph Seebohn and Jacob Kaiser—have gone much further. Kaiser, for example, told a Catholic party congress:

No real Europe can be formed until the German bloc is reconstituted. I remind you that this bloc includes, in addition to Germany, Austria, a part of Switzerland, the Saar of course, Alsace and Lorraine. When I think of the Strasbourg Cathedral, my heart hurts.

At Essen last July, the Chancellor said:

The creation of a Europe which is politically and economically strong is the only path leading to the recovery of Germany's Eastern territories, which remains one of the essential goals of our activities.

German nationalism—and even more so, German irredentism—are highly charged with emotion. And it has become increasingly plain in recent months that West Germany was willing to play a part in international containment of the Soviet world in proportion as the role made more possible German national expansion.

In itself, Adenauer's demand, which his denial doesn't nullify, for West Germany's admittance to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization isn't either extraordinary or unreasonable. If the West Germans are to play an equal part in military containment, they have the right to be treated as citizens of a country equal to the others in the alliance.

The denial of the statement, however, reveals that the emotional pressures behind irredentism in West Germany, as they become domestic political forces, put Adenauer's government in the position of needing to play a double game. Nor is this situation unique in present-day politics. What is "true" for a domestic public opinion is often a half-truth or less for world commitments, and the other way around.

Whereas the government of any country with a firm democratic tradition and real experience with democratic process, even a weak country like France, may be able to control political emotions, the situation in Germany is different.

The problem of containing the German containers has been moved up from the future to the present because the question has been posed *now* of West Germany's entrance into the NATO. Postponement or shelving the demand aren't answers. For, no matter when West Germany becomes a member, the nature of the alliance will automatically become different because of Germany's membership. An alliance designed to be defensive cannot fail to be influenced by the aggressive impulses and desires of an important member.

If West German leaders become tougher, bolder, more demanding while their country is being courted, it is scarcely conceivable that they will become milder when Germany becomes a member of the NATO and, as is inevitable, the husband of the Franco-German family and the master of the West German house. By all precedents, German appetites will increase as the plate of power is better filled. And even this isn't the most disquieting prospect. With West Germany a member of the NATO, making a large contribution and always asking an even larger price for it, there is the plain danger that the double game will become a single game—that Germans will speak in international councils with the voice and the words they now reserve for the domestic public.

West Germany in the NATO may well become the catalyst for all the roll-back, rather than containment, tendencies; and since union, European or Atlantic, is bound to influence the balance of domestic political forces in every member state, the by-product may well be help also for rollbacks of democracy. This may happen. It also may not, if the US refrains from brushing aside British and French worries about Germany, and if there is real three-power co-operation *now* to contain clearly and bindingly the nature of West Germany's role in the NATO.

Paris

PERCY WINNER

RATING THE SENATORS

RECENTLY we asked a group of political scientists specializing in legislation to rate members of the US Senate.

by **Byron L. Johnson**
and **W. E. Butt**

We knew that "the man in the street" forms opinions about the merit of the members of the US Senate from a number of sources, many of which may not be germane to the Senator's true competence. We felt that trained students of legislation, on the other hand, would make informed judgments largely free from provincial, partisan or emotional bias. In order to test this, we asked each of the legislation specialists, most of whom are college teachers, to apply the conventional percentage grading system. We added that: "the worst Senator should draw a grade no higher than 30 percent, with the average, or typical, grade about 75 percent, and so on up to 100 percent." We took the mean average of the scores submitted, and then ranked these. The results can be seen on the opposite page.

The size of the sample was large enough so that we had good representation by geographical area, age and partisan affiliation. It is doubtful that the results would be changed appreciably by increasing the number of returns. Slightly more than half of the responses came from either Democrats or "Independent-Democrats." The rest were from Republicans and Independents, in equal numbers. Examination of the differences between the ratings by parties, however, discloses so little variation in the averages as to warrant lumping them together in the final calculations.

The political scientists were asked to note, in rating the Senators, whether they viewed each of five traits as strong or weak points: attitude on domestic issues, attitude on foreign issues, legislative ability, intellectual ability and personal integrity. On this basis Sen. Paul Douglas (D, Ill.) was consistently rated ahead of all the others, and high tribute was paid to his ability, training and integrity. One independent summarized the view of many by referring to him as "the measuring stick for all the others." Sen. Joe McCarthy (R, Wis.), on the other hand, did badly on all five counts. The opinion of the experts was unanimous that his personal integrity was his weakest point, but his stand on both domestic and foreign issues was almost universally criticized. Only his legislative ability drew any praise, and then only from one-fourth of the Republican respondents. Com-

ments added to the replies were strong. Republican political scientists characterized him as "not worthy of a Senate seat," and "a disgrace to the US Senate."

McCarthy, like the cheese in "The Farmer in the Dell," stands alone in the opinion of these experts. Sen. William Jenner (R, Ind.) had little competition for runner-up. His score was even lower among the Republicans and Independents than among the Democrats. About one-fourth were willing to concede that his personal integrity was strong, however, which distinguishes him somewhat from Senator McCarthy. His crudeness drew special criticism as being beneath the dignity of a Senator.

The two low-ranking Democrats, Sens. Kenneth McKellar (Tenn.) and Pat McCarran (Nev.), who are chairmen of powerful Senate committees, drew praise for their legislative ability from their critics, even as they deplored the use to which this ability is put.

Senator Taft drew a surprisingly low rank of 24, rather than placing in the first 10, as many would expect. The Republican and Independent reviewers were just as critical of his foreign-policy position as the Democrats, three-fourths of both groups rating Taft's foreign policy as a weak point. The Republicans tended to support his domestic views, one-fourth of the Democrats also viewed his domestic policy as a strong point.

Political scientists of all parties are unanimous in praise of Senator Taft's legislative and intellectual ability. His personal integrity was rated as a weak point by 23 percent of these professionals. At least some of this criticism was attributed directly to his handling of Senator McCarthy. It is worthy of note that McCarthy's outspoken critics rated high, Sen. Margaret Smith (R, Me.) ranking sixth, and Sen. William Benton (D, Conn.) ranking fifteenth. Taft was also criticized as having "been too much affected with 'Presidentitis'."

It is an encouraging sign that, in the opinion of these experts many of the best Senators are newcomers. Twelve of the first 20 Senators are still in their first term of six years, and four more are now in their eighth year of service. Only four of the top 20 have been in the Senate longer than 10 years. Worthy of special note is the meteoric rise of the ex-capital reporter, Blair Moody, as Senator from Michigan, the rank of 19 in less than one year. While Senator Moody has not yet established his legislative ability, his intellectual capacity, his integrity and his approach to both domestic and foreign issues won acclaim from experts of both parties.

Dr. Byron L. Johnson, professor of Economics at Denver University, and W. E. Butt, professor of Economics (retired) at Pennsylvania State College, jointly conducted the poll of political scientists discussed in this article.

Ranking of US Senators by Political Scientists

1. Paul H. Douglas	Illinois	49. Homer Ferguson	Michigan
2. Estes Kefauver	Tennessee	50. Guy M. Gillette	Iowa
3. Wayne Morse	Oregon	51. Eugene D. Millikin	Colorado
4. Herbert H. Lehman	New York	52. Robert S. Kerr	Oklahoma
5. J. William Fulbright	Arkansas	53. Edward Martin	Pennsylvania
6. Margaret Chase Smith	Maine	54. Frank Carlson	Kansas
7. Henry Cabot Lodge Jr.	Massachusetts	55. Thomas C. Hennings Jr.	Missouri
8. George Aiken	Vermont	56. Spessard L. Holland	Florida
9. Leverett Saltonstall	Massachusetts	57. Milton R. Young	North Dakota
10. Brien McMahon	Connecticut	58. Allen J. Ellender Sr.	Louisiana
11. A. S. Mike Monroney	Oklahoma	59. John L. McClellan	Arkansas
12. Irving M. Ives	New York	60. Harry Flood Byrd	Virginia
13. John J. Sparkman	Alabama	61. A. Willis Robertson	Virginia
14. Hubert Humphrey	Minnesota	62. Alexander Wiley	Wisconsin
15. William Benton	Connecticut	63. Guy Cordon	Oregon
16. Lister Hill	Alabama	64. Edwin C. Johnson	Colorado
17. Joseph C. O'Mahoney	Wyoming	65. Willis Smith	North Carolina
18. James H. Duff	Pennsylvania	66. Thomas R. Underwood	Kentucky
19. Blair Moody	Michigan	67. John C. Stennis	Mississippi
20. Charles W. Tobey	New Hampshire	68. J. Allen Frear Jr.	Delaware
21. Ralph E. Flanders	Vermont	69. Earle C. Clements	Kentucky
22. James E. Murray	Montana	70. George A. Smathers	Florida
23. Theodore Francis Green	Rhode Island	71. Richard M. Nixon	California
24. Robert A. Taft	Ohio	72. William Langer	North Dakota
25. Richard B. Russell	Georgia	73. Francis Case	South Dakota
26. Carl Hayden	Arizona	74. Wallace F. Bennett	Utah
27. Lyndon B. Johnson	Texas	75. Zales N. Ecton	Montana
28. Clinton P. Anderson	New Mexico	76. Andrew F. Schoeppel	Kansas
29. Harley M. Kilgore	West Virginia	77. Owen Brewster	Maine
30. Ernest W. McFarland	Arizona	78. Styles Bridges	New Hampshire
31. Walter F. George	Georgia	79. Karl E. Mundt	South Dakota
32. John J. Williams	Delaware	80. Bourke B. Hickenlooper	Iowa
33. Matthew M. Neely	West Virginia	81. Arthur V. Watkins	Utah
34. H. Alexander Smith	New Jersey	82. James O. Eastland	Mississippi
35. Lester C. Hunt	Wyoming	83. James P. Kem	Missouri
36. Dennis Chavez	New Mexico	84. Hugh Butler	Nebraska
37. Tom Connally	Texas	85. Henry C. Dworshak	Idaho
38. Russell B. Long	Louisiana	86. John W. Bricker	Ohio
39. Warren G. Magnuson	Washington	87. Pat McCarran	Nevada
40. John O. Pastore	Rhode Island	88. John M. Butler	Maryland
41. Olin D. Johnston	South Carolina	89. Herman Welker	Idaho
42. Edward Thyne	Minnesota	90. Homer E. Capehart	Indiana
43. Robert C. Hendrickson	New Jersey	91. Harry P. Cain	Washington
44. William F. Knowland	California	92. George W. Malone	Nevada
45. Clyde R. Hoey	North Carolina	93. Kenneth McKellar	Tennessee
46. Burnet R. Maybank	South Carolina	94. William E. Jenner	Indiana
47. Herbert R. O'Connor	Maryland	95. Joseph R. McCarthy	Wisconsin
48. Everett M. Dirksen	Illinois		

The names of Republican Senators in *italics*.

No rating is shown for Sen. Kenneth Wherry (R, Neb.) due to his death during the time this study was being made.

McCARRAN'S IRON CURTAIN

I. Visitors: Not Welcome

THE UNITED STATES, known in saner days as "the great melting pot of democracy," is fast becoming an impenetrable and hostile fortress in the eyes of much of the world. Immigrants and would-be visitors from other lands are literally stunned by the stringent provisions of the McCarran Internal Security Act of 1950—provisions that would be made even harsher in the proposed new immigration and exclusion laws.

An inpouring of all races and faiths was deemed healthy and democratic by the nation's founding fathers. But today, when the legislative counterparts of the DAR are riding high, it is held that nationalistic purity would be endangered by such an aged policy. Conformism is the watchword, and toe-the-line thinking the password for entry into the land of the free and the brave.

The damaging effects of the Internal Security Act in terms of bad propaganda abroad have been made evident. But of special importance are the visa-control sections of the proposed new law which gouge so crudely and cruelly into the sensitive area of diplomatic relations. The Kremlin need not lift a finger to make propaganda out of the visa situation. It is self-propelling. Countries friendly to the United States have expressed shock and disillusionment. In Europe there is mounting talk of an American Iron Curtain at about the same time that Russia, for its own self-serving purposes, is fully publicizing its cordial invitation to businessmen from the US and elsewhere to attend the International Economic Conference in Moscow next April.

Renowned scientists and internationally known scholars have been refused visas to visit the United States pending an exhaustive study of their backgrounds, doubtless including their playmates in grammar school and the social tone of high-school essays. The latest victim was Graham Greene, distinguished Catholic novelist, who freely acknowledged to a mechanistic consular official abroad that he had joined the Communist Party as a prank, when scarcely over adolescence, and had renounced membership soon thereafter. Before the Attorney General could make an exception to the visa provision, Greene's name had been spread all across the globe as a possible security risk. By the time he was admitted, the damage to US prestige as a democratic haven, to

by **Edward A. Harris**

international relations and to Greene's morale and reputation, was done.

Another recent case in point was that of Professor Marcus Oliphant, noted Australian scientist, who applied for a visa to attend a conference of nuclear physicists in Chicago. The visa was not refused; it was simply held up pending a lengthy inquiry. Professor Oliphant politely withdrew his application when the conference took place while a half-dozen security agencies here were looking into his "background." Later, officials acknowledged they could find nothing to bar him.

Dr. Ernest B. Chain, Nobel Prize winner in biochemistry, applied last April for a visa to consult with the World Health Organization, and last October for permission to attend a meeting of the American Committee of the Weizmann Institute of Science. Both requests were denied. Such cases could be multiplied many times over.

The blind dragnet section of the McCarran Act that caused such chaos when the Act was first passed in 1950 barred all aliens who had ever advocated or had any connection with such doctrines as the overthrow of the government by force, or who were in any way associated with any movement, group or doctrine of that nature. Complaints from foreign embassies flooded the State Department. Protests were violent, particularly from Italy, Spain and Western Germany, since one-time members of the Fascist, the Falangist and the Nazi parties were barred from entering the US unless excepted by the Attorney General.

Even Senator McCarran could see that something was wrong. Under an amendment passed last March 28, Europeans are now permitted entry if their one-time membership in Nazi, Fascist or Communist organizations was involuntary. The amendment lifted the barrier for those who joined totalitarian parties when they were less than 16 years old, when they were forced to join by law, or when such membership was essential to secure work or food.

The change removed much of the heavy pressure from Spain, Italy and Germany. But the law's clumsy and persistent application to one-time Communists who reformed, and to countless other applicants for visas who turn out to be 100-percent pure after inquiries lasting from two to eight months, is proving of immeasurable harm to US prestige. Political and cultural officials of the State Department are highly concerned about the

Edward A. Harris is a member of the Washington bureau of the St. Louis Post Dispatch and a Pulitzer Prize winner.

situation, but can do little. The shadow of McCarran looms large over the department, with many normally courageous career men reluctant to do anything that might be subject to criticism.

Two key men in the application of the Act are Visa Division Chief Herve J. L'Heureux and his assistant, Robert C. Alexander. They concede that the delays in "clearing" or barring visa applicants are bad, but otherwise find little fault with the visa provisions. No one questions the patriotism of these two public servants. They admire Senator McCarran, and they earnestly want to keep their country clean. Alexander was equally sincere, if somewhat addle-pated, when he caused an inter-

national sensation by telling a Senate committee—McCarran's Judiciary Committee—that the UN was a beehive of foreign spies. George C. Marshall, who was Secretary of State at the time, publicly rebuked Alexander.

As if all this were not enough, new surprises are being planned in the McCarran omnibus immigration bill. There is even talk of making a fine distinction between Communists and other totalitarians, on the theory, doubtless, that Nazis who ranted about their "super race" and destroyed thousands of children and their elders in gas vaults are far more worthy to visit and live with us than repentant Communists who fell for an idealistic mirage. Such is the New Order.

II. Immigrants: Still Fewer Wanted

FOR A HUNDRED years of our history, the latch-string and the welcome mat were out to immigrants to the United States from every part of the world. Those sufficiently adventurous or unhappy were given the opportunity to share in our great adventure and happiness.

But American attitude and policy began to change during the 1880's with the enactment of the Chinese Exclusion Act and has become steadily tighter ever since. The "Gentlemen's Agreement" negotiated by Teddy Roosevelt almost entirely dried up Japanese immigration. In 1917 practically all of Asia was barred—a policy still in force with negligible exceptions, and one the adverse repercussions of which are growing louder daily. In 1924, the quota pattern which we have now was set. It is contrary, in theory, to all the truths we hold and capable, in operation, of unfair and discriminatory application. It is based on racist doctrines which we have long professed to abhor, and for 25 years has operated to give large quotas to Western and Northern Europe where they were not used, and small ones to Eastern and Southern Europe where they were badly needed. The effect has been to keep people out of the country. Total quota limits for most of the world are approximately 154,000 annually, but net immigration for the 20-year period prior to 1950 averaged only 46,000 a year, about one-thirtieth of one percent of our total population. Even the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 which provided for the admission of 340,000 refugees, charged all immigrants against future quotas. It was simply a mortgage on immigration to come and will affect drastically the number of persons who can find sanctuary here for many years.

We are now fighting a global ideological war which,

Fowler Harper is a professor of law at Yale University.

by Fowler Harper

if we win, we think will avoid an atomic war. We are trying to make friends and influence nations. In this business, we are prepared to spend X billion dollars to try to convince the people of Asia and the rest of the East, Middle and Near, that our system of government is a basis for at least a tolerable way of life for everyone. It might be supposed that our immigration policy would have some bearing on this problem. In a world changing as fast as this one, changes in our immigration laws ought to be under consideration. They are.

The 82nd Congress will face the problem. There are two proposals and both of them involve extensive policy modifications. One is sponsored by Sen. Pat McCarran (D, Nev.) whose bill was introduced in the House by Rep. Francis Walters (D, Pa.). Another is sponsored by Herbert Lehman (D, N.Y.) in the Senate, a comparable one by Rep. Emanuel Celler (D, N.Y.) in the House.

The McCarran bill is advertised as a codification and simplification of the immigration laws. It contains 295 pages of language so tricky that even the lawyers in Philadelphia will have to read it two or three times. The present immigration laws occupy 80 pages of the US Code. As an example of the "simplification" of the law, the test whether the admission of an alien is in the public interest is buried away in subclause (b) of clause ii of subparagraph I of paragraph (28) of subsection (a) of Section 212 of Chapter 1 of Title II of Chapter 6 of Title VIII of the Code. Granted that a considerable degree of skill in draftsmanship is required to write a comprehensive immigration law, the practice of making subclauses of subparagraphs incorporate each other by reference and the use of dozens of "Provided, however" is carrying "simplification" pretty far, if an alien is expected to make much sense out of it.

The bill is full of substantive changes, practically all of which are designed to keep people out of the country or get them out if somehow they get in. There are many new grounds for deportation. Under existing law, an alien may be deported for the commission of a crime involving moral turpitude if he has been imprisoned for more than a year. If the offense was committed more than five years after his entry, two convictions are necessary. Under the McCarran bill, conviction of any offense, however trivial, subjects the alien to immediate deportation if the Attorney General wants to deport him. Thus, an alien could be deported on conviction of violating a traffic ordinance carrying a \$5 fine, or indeed, for spitting on the sidewalk or for throwing away an empty cigarette package without destroying or tearing the tax stamp. Deportation is serious business for the alien and in many cases may be the equivalent of a death sentence or a long term in a "correction" camp. For some, the term will in fact be for life because in many of these camps it doesn't take long to serve it. And when one reflects that trials for petty offenses do not carry the constitutional protections of jury trial and right to counsel, it is easy to see how an alien may be a sitting duck for extortioners or malicious-minded neighbors.

Also deportable are aliens who had been convicted abroad of two or more offenses carrying total punishment of five years imprisonment regardless of whether the offenses involved moral turpitude. It is true that "purely political offenses" are excepted. But we do not know whether failure of a Jew to register under the Nazis would be regarded by the Immigration Service as "purely political" or not. And it would be pretty hard to characterize as "political" the failure of a worker in an Iron Curtain country to produce as much as the Commissar ordered or the attempt of a farmer to withhold a pig or a chicken in a collectivization drive.

Except those in preferred classes, all quota and some non-quota immigrants who expect to do skilled or unskilled labor are excludable under the McCarran bill if the Secretary of Labor has certified that at the time the alien makes application for a visa there are sufficient numbers of qualified workers or that the employment of the alien would adversely affect the wages and working conditions of those already engaged in such employment. If such an alien manages to get in, he is deportable. But the bill also provides that an alien who in the opinion of the Attorney General becomes a public charge may be deported unless it appears that he became such from causes that arose after his entry. Thus, one alien could be deported because he works for a living while another is deported because he does *not* work.

There are many other pitfalls which the immigrant must avoid if he wants to stay in the country. Under the present law drug peddlers may be deported. If the McCarran bill becomes law, their victims will also be deportable. So too, an alien is subject to deportation if he becomes mentally defective to the points where he requires institutionalization within five years even though his family is able and willing to support him. And if the alien changes his address, he had better not fail to notify the immigration authorities within five days.

Perhaps one of the harshest features of the McCarran bill is the repeal of the statute of limitations on deportation. Under existing law if the alien is admitted, the decision of the government, with a few exceptions, becomes final after five years. If the McCarran bill passes, all limitations will be abolished, and the alien may be deported many years after his entry. Moreover, the provisions on deportation are expressly made applicable to *all* aliens, including those already here. Thus many who are not deportable now will become so if this bill becomes law.

Not only does the McCarran proposal introduce many new hazards to the immigrant but it also makes it much harder for him to acquire citizenship. On the other hand it makes it much easier for him to lose it. Under the Internal Security (McCarran) Act of 1950, an alien cannot even be admitted to the country if he is, or ever had been, a member of a number of proscribed organizations, including, of course, the Communist Party. Under the new McCarran Act, he cannot become a citizen if he ever belonged to the "direct predecessor or successor" of a Communist or totalitarian organization "regardless of what name such group or organization may have used, may now bear or may hereafter adopt." Thus, if an alien had once belonged to the Czechoslovakian equivalent of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, subsequently captured by a Communist group, he would be ineligible for American citizenship even though he resigned as soon as and because the organization went Red. Moreover, under the proposed bill which substitutes "concealment of a material fact" for "fraud" as a basis for denaturalization, an immigrant who acquires citizenship could lose it if he forgot to tell of a trivial contribution to an organization which subsequently became subversive, provided the judge didn't believe he forgot.

Senator Lehman, backed by Senators Humphrey, Ives, Hendrickson, Kefauver, Kilgore, Moody, Douglas, Murray, Magnuson, Langer, Morse, Pastore and Gillette have introduced a competing immigration bill. It, too, proposes many changes. It is directed generally at removal

of the inequalities and discriminatory features of the present law and at the admission of the full quota of immigrants each year. It provides for the pooling of unused quotas, to be distributed on a preferential basis to admit persons with needed skills, to reunite divided families and to afford asylum for the persecuted. It eliminates race as a barrier to immigration and naturalization. It provides for preferences within quotas to brothers, sisters and adult children of American citizens and to parents of alien residents. It removes sex discrimination. It permits the admission of persons who can show that their past affiliation with prescribed organ-

izations was "nominal," "involuntary," terminated before their sixteenth birthday, or maintained to secure employment or to escape persecution. It also admits, under certain circumstances, refugees from Iron Curtain countries even though they had been members of the Communist Party while there.

Here are two important proposals for the amendment of our immigration laws. If one of them is adopted in whole or in large part, the choice will have an important impact on the liberties of thousands of citizens and residents of the US and on the esteem which our country can command from nations we want for our friends.

DANGER OF DICTATORSHIP IN INDIA

THE EMERGENCE of the Communist Party as a disturbing political factor of incalculable potentiality is the most significant feature of India's general election. It has surprised everybody. But it should not have been unexpected.

The Indian Communists did not have the advantage of their comrades in China and other countries of Southeast Asia. But conditions favorable for them were maturing in India. Signal failure to fulfill the tall promises made previously had spread mass disaffection with the established order. Inefficiency, corruption and highhandedness of the new rulers, particularly of the lower ranks, had discredited the Congress Party and shaken morale. The Communists exploited the progressively worsening situation. There was increasing evidence that, notwithstanding the repressive policy of the government, the Communist Party was gaining ground. But even now the ruling party seems to minimize the threat to its monopolist position. The end of one-party rule, under the circumstances, may not be a calamity. But the impending multi-party chaos, heralded by the election, will facilitate the rise of an avowedly dictatorial regime.

In addition to the factors mentioned above, the spectacular emergence of the Communist Party is due to the fact that it represents a clear and consistent opposition to the party in power—politically, socially and ideologically. All the other opposition groups, except the small crypto-Communist and pseudo-Communist ones, are chips off the same old bloc—the Congress. There is little to choose between them and the mother organization. The Communist Party offers the point of crystal-

by **M. N. Roy**

lization for the disillusioned and the discontented. The experience of five years of constitutional government has blasted the popular hope of a gradual improvement of the conditions of life. It has also shaken the faith in older ideologies. In this atmosphere of despair and disillusionment, a program promising a clean sweep of the established order has a strong appeal.

Their initial triumph, significant though it is, does not yet place the Communists in a position to implement their maximum program. How they will follow up the initial success is still a matter of speculation. They have not yet shown their hand. And it seems that there is difference of opinion among themselves. Nevertheless, the pattern of their activities in the near future can be imagined. It is very unlikely that their effort to form coalition ministries in Madras and Travancore-Cochin will succeed. If it did, they would hardly behave as tamely as they now promise to beguile possible allies. One of their leaders has given out the secret. Communist-dominated coalition governments in one or two states would function as the points of resistance to the Central Government. This policy, if pursued boldly, would plunge the country in a civil war. Since that pattern of development is not very likely in the near future, the Communists may pretend to play the leader of a constitutional opposition. They would be very well advised to do so because time will work in their favor. At the same time, they cannot take the risk of resting on their oars. The promises with which they duped the ignorant masses of voters do not stand any scrutiny. Given time, the dupes may see through them.

Therefore, in the near future, Communist tactics must be spectacular to fire popular imagination and demonstrate their strength. Moreover, their avowed object being capture of power as the condition for the fulfill-

Manvendra Nath Roy was the first Indian Communist leader. He headed the Eastern section of the Communist International from 1920-29 and as such was sent to China to apply Comintern policy. He broke with Stalin in 1930. Today as head of the Radical Humanist Movement and contributor to leading newspapers, he is famous throughout India as a writer and philosopher.

ment of their promises, they are sure to adopt tactics calculated to shake further the stability of the established order. Whether they would travel the Chinese way to the extent of establishing their "Yenan" cannot yet be said. It is by no means excluded, if no effective counterforce crystallizes before long. If the situation drifts as it has until now, the Communists will be able to capture power, build up an armed force and entrench themselves in a much larger area than Yenan.

Most probably, the Communists' tactics in the near future will be what they call mass mobilization and infiltration of the institutions of the established order, including the state machinery and the armed forces, with the sympathy and support of the educated middle class. The electoral success will attract numerous recruits to their ranks, and the novices will come from all walks of society. The inducement is not so much economic betterment as political power, which fires the imagination of the illiterate masses as well as of the educated middle class.

Whatever the government may do, the Communists cannot be stopped. As between the Congress and the Communist Party, the latter will gain in popularity.

The sanction of the Communist appeal is not its ostensible social idealism, but the formidable power of the Russo-Chinese bloc. How the Communist Party will act in the new situation will be determined by the foreign policy of Russia, which still remains the center of the Communist world. Even the relation between Peiping and Delhi will be shaped according to the political strategy of Moscow. On the other hand, Russia's attitude toward India will be influenced by the development of Indo-American relations. There has been much speculation and controversy on this score. But it is to a large extent predetermined. The foreign policy of a government logically follows from its approach to the problems at home. Notwithstanding Nehru's admiration for Red China and the economic system of Soviet Russia, none ever believed that he would encourage the growth of Communism in India or ally her definitely with the Communist power-bloc. It is not a convincing performance to admire Communism at a distance while fighting it here at home. A really neutral and independent foreign policy presupposes a national economy which does not rely on foreign financial aid. Inasmuch as the Nehru government's economic policy cannot do without foreign aid, its foreign policy is predetermined. The aid can come only from America. It will not necessarily mean any control of the internal politics of the country. But it will mean closer Indo-American relations. Recent events have moved quite fast in that direction.

This reorientation of India's foreign policy has naturally alarmed Russia. China cannot hold out any substantial inducement which would tempt India away from the US. So, Russia has acted directly. Having maintained a noncommittal attitude toward the Kashmir dispute all along, Russia has suddenly thrown her weight in favor of India. America has made the counter-move by persuading the UN to shelve the issue again. It is doubtful if Russian backing would reinforce Indian intransigence. But it would certainly win for the Indian Communists many new allies from the ranks of the Hindu Communist organizations.

Russia has more than one iron in the fire. While trying to please India by backing her claim in Kashmir, she is tightening the screws also. Communist infiltration of Nepal from Tibet is a threat. And the Communists are entrenched all along the Indo-Burmese border. So, India is threatened from inside as well as outside. In this situation, Nehru can no longer sit on the fence. A polarization of the political forces inside the country as the power of the Congress declines will compel Indian foreign policy to move toward the one or the other hub of the international axis. The powerful patrons of the Congress Party and vested interest generally will press for an unambiguous American orientation. They seem to have won already. Nevertheless, Nehru is not likely to change abruptly India's attitude toward China.

Now that the Indian Communist Party has emerged as the strongest parliamentary opposition, a policy of treating it as an outlawed disruptive factor will no longer be consistent with a friendly attitude toward China and admiration for the achievements of Russia. A more tolerant policy will enable the Communists to entrench themselves, preparatory to revolutionary mass action.

Then, intoxicated with their initial victory, the Communists may make premature moves, such as will justify drastic measures for the maintenance of law and order. This ominous development will be approved in the democratic world, particularly in America, as necessary to combat Communism. To maintain political stability in the only Asian country where a strong bastion against Communism can possibly be built, the established regime will be given all manner of aid. The Communists can be expected to retaliate with an all-out offensive. India will have to choose between two contending types of dictatorship. And as far as the politically indifferent and emotionally unregimented majority of the people concerned, no choice will be given. One or the other form of dictatorship will be imposed by violence.

A LETTER FROM ISRAEL

HOW DID YOU manage to get 14 seats in the first general election?" someone asked Mr. Beigin, leader of Israel's right-wing Herut party and former underground fighter. "Because I chased the British out of Palestine, and everyone was glad," he replied. "And why did you only get eight seats in the 1951 elections?" "Because," Mr. Beigin added sadly, "I chased the British out of Palestine, and many now regret it." Although few in Israel would trade the independence of the state for the economic stability of the mandate, there are those who look somewhat wistfully to the days when the shops were full of meat, vegetables, chocolate, shoes.

Now the shops are almost bare, and instead of the Israel pound being worth \$2.80, the dollar is worth 2.80 Israel pounds. Every day prices and wages go up and the queues at the stores get longer. To check this inflation, everyone has his own theory—devaluation, special exchange rates, compulsory saving, wage freezes—but wonders how he personally can escape the consequences of such a policy. The government talks of "drastic measures," but, split internally and relying on a small parliamentary majority, it is unable to decide what form these measures should take. Meanwhile the necessary public spirit to meet the crisis is lacking, and the population is getting demoralized.

It was partly from this dissatisfaction that Mr. Beigin hoped to profit. His party, Herut, was rapidly sinking into oblivion; it had no real policy except to remind everyone of its former exploits against the British—but these tales were getting tarnished. The Knesset debate on German reparations, a problem very close to public conscience, was a suitable occasion for rabble-rousing. Mr. Beigin provoked the mob to attack the Knesset. The British press spoke of "Civil War in Israel!"—but as the last whiffs of tear gas faded away so too did Mr. Beigin.

Due to the general world shortage and Israel's lack of foreign currency, low stocks of newsprint cut down daily papers for several days to two-page issues. However, new supplies have arrived, and papers can now print four pages on four days a week, two pages twice a week, with a four-page supplement on Friday.

However, it would take an artillery salvo to make headlines in Jerusalem, as almost every night one hears

rifle shots along the frontier. Friction on Israel's borders continues, and Arab infiltration is becoming less of a sport and more of a menace. Cattle rustling has been going on for years, but now murder, kidnapping and rape have been added to Arab border activities.

These raids of violence are being met by stricter patrols, the re-establishment of a "home guard," and by severe terms of imprisonment on any infiltrators taken prisoner. But the most hopeful way of stopping the incidents is through the co-operation of the Syrian and Jordan governments, who seem to be taking Israel's protests a little more seriously. But even during the day one hears explosions as the rocky hills round Israel's capital are being blasted in preparation for new building.

Throughout the country one sees a tremendous amount of construction—new houses, new schools, new factories, new hospitals. By the roadside huge yellow machines from America are leveling the ground, quarrying rock and digging trenches for water pipes.

Most weekends I go up to Tiberias, and pass a new agricultural settlement which has mushroomed out of the ground within the space of seven days.

However, in Jerusalem, the largest building scheme is the new government center—a miniature Washington, D.C. Terraces are now being carved from the hillside, where the various ministries will be grouped round a new Knesset. The President's residence, the National Bank, the Archives and the State Museum will also be built here in a setting of parks and gardens and pools.

Nearby one can see the gaunt yet imposing outline of Jerusalem's new festival hall, one of the largest buildings of its kind in the world, which will seat 4,000. The building will be completed by May, next year, in time for a music festival which will celebrate the 3,000th anniversary of King David's rule. More than 40 countries are expected to participate.

The United States has been well represented on Israel's stage recently. A successful run of "Death of a Salesman" (in Hebrew) has just ended, and productions, also in Hebrew, of the "Glass Menagerie" and "Of Mice and Men" are playing to packed houses.

Jerusalem

DAN SAMUEL



BOOKS IN REVIEW

THE CONTINUING PURSUIT OF HERMAN MELVILLE

IN ITS OFFERING of *Typee*, *Billy Budd* and the short stories of Melville, the Modern Library appears to be trying to kill two birds with one stone. But I should imagine that both birds would make their escape, for the student of Melville will probably own the first two items at least and the newcomer can

SELECTED WRITINGS OF HERMAN MELVILLE (The Modern Library; \$2.45).

THE PORTABLE MELVILLE. Edited by Jay Leyda (The Viking Press; \$2.50).

THE MELVILLE LOG: A DOCUMENTARY LIFE OF HERMAN MELVILLE, by Jay Leyda (Harcourt, Brace; 2 vols., \$12.50).

HERMAN MELVILLE: A BIOGRAPHY, by Leon Howard (University of California Press; \$5).

hardly be expected to interest himself in very many of the stories. *The Portable Melville* is not only much fuller but much better devised. In this Jay Leyda alternates selections from Melville's writings with biographical information and pertinent letters. He has thus made a survey of Melville that, with its extensive bibliography, is altogether as satisfactory as such a book can be.

It is in *The Melville Log*, however, that Leyda's scholarship really comes into its own. Here he presents us with a remarkable assemblage and arrangement of what appears to be all the known facts about and very nearly all the documents pertaining to Melville, along with portraits and contemporary drawings and woodcuts. He calls it a documentary life and pretends that with it in hand each reader can be his own biographer. I don't suppose anyone will or could form much idea of Melville's life from these volumes alone, and Leyda himself genially admits his self-imposed limitations. "How can a book of documents point to the sick-list where Melville's name did not appear . . . or the banquet

by Katherine Hoskins

to which he was not invited?" But this partial failure of intent does not by any means diminish the worth of the book. As a reference, as a compendium of Melvilleana, it is of the greatest value and interest. And often his method shines—as when, with no editorial comment to weaken the evocations, he juxtaposes a description of a pile of logs in Hawthorne's journal of the summer when he lived near Melville with an excerpt from *Israel Potter*, written some three years later, in which the same pile reappears altered only to greater solidity and vividness.

Perhaps the most rewarding single item (also to be found in the *Portable*) is the complete text of a letter that Melville wrote to Hawthorne soon after the publication of *Moby Dick*. Of course, for the whole association of those two, we could wish that some shrewd and innocent old Berkshire dame had remarked for the benefit of posterity, "Why, he just fell in love with that Mr. Hawthorne."

In the absence of such authority for a simple approach, the biographers have usually quoted from the letter and proceeded to elaborate interpretations. But no second-hand account can do justice to the caliber of the love that it expresses for Hawthorne. Certain of its emphases read like notes for Montaigne's essay on Etienne de la Boétie. And the event to which it bears witness seems truly to have been the kind of love that, according to Montaigne, occurs about once in 300 years—a *coup de foudre* that few are of the stature to experience. Most agree that it blasted Melville open to himself and permitted him to effect the final form of *Moby Dick*. In its great happiness, the letter is a moving reminder of how brief was the period in which, though himself drawn to a heroic scale, he could create and live in a climate of unfearful freedoms.

When so considerable an authority as Leyda states that Leon Howard of the University of California has produced "the best biography of Melville in our time," we are inclined to pay attention. Howard needs this recommendation, for he does not present himself in any very winning light. In his preface, he interrupts his acknowledgments to describe what his biography will *not* be like. "To those critics who insist that a work of literature makes its most admirable appearance as an independent object of aesthetic experience, I can only suggest that the arts which we call the humanities are, as a matter of fact, unavoidably human." After this illuminating statement, we encounter: "Nor can I share another widespread assumption: that literature draws most of its peculiar nourishment from the substrata of the author's mind, below the level of his conscious motives and desires." He qualifies this to some extent, but is evidently not going to lay much stress on what Gide called "the part God puts in." Indeed he seems eager to protect us from such matters. For, except for those who gave him direct and positive aid, his precursors in the field are buried in the epilogue under such references as "the English novelist," "the college professor," "the ingenious Swedenborgian."

Howard's own intention is "to understand the author of *Moby Dick* and other books as a human being living in nineteenth century America." "To understand" is a large order, but if we substitute "to present the author, etc.," then we must admit that Howard's work is vastly successful. In the procession of names, dates, visits given and received with probable sentiments attached, he recreates in terrifying detail the society in which Melville seems to have lived. The book moves with such all-inclusive accuracy, such deadly lack of accent, it is sprinkled with such arch

witticisms and common-sense reflections as could have been achieved only by one spiritually akin to Melville's family and friends. Every tree in the forest is accounted for and Melville, more uncommunicative than *Bartleby* himself, wanders in and out of them in reluctant reincarnation. And at that Howard does not evoke a very different Melville from the one we have been accustomed to; he merely makes him harder to get at. To a far greater extent than the more intuitive biographers, it is he who brings home to us the inexorable domesticity, the crowding trivia of Melville's life, who lays him out helpless as Gulliver in Lilliput. It is Howard who underlines the schizophrenic solution that most societies ask of their gifted members and that our own so fiercely exacts.

Perhaps it is a pity that the Leyda treasury should have taken off the one possible edge to Howard's work. Events of Melville's life will always be interesting and, if we had no other, we might have accepted this book as a dictionary of details. As it is, I think we shall continue to have recourse, among others, to Newton Arvin or William Ellery Sedgwick. For their books are the kind that kindle us to meditate on a great writer and on the mysteries of creation. And that, it seems to me, is the function of biography. Insistence on externals as constituting the important life of an artist seems false primarily because it is a denial of that blackjacking of the self experienced by every man who produces a work of art and which prevents him thereafter from standing foursquare to the world, from regarding the world's work as more than his left-handed concern. However ambidexterous he may be, it is a cruelty and a cheapening to treat him as a man of letters, an ordinary citizen who writes books.

Flaubert, largely in self-protection, described the artist as a monster. Certainly, the hero who would get within hailing distance of him must share a little of the monstrous nature of his prey.

Katherine Hoskins has published a volume of poems and contributes poetry and criticism to the Hudson, Partisan and Sewanee reviews.

UNHAPPY PARALLEL

CRISIS IN FREEDOM: THE ALIEN AND SEDITION ACTS, by John C. Miller (Atlantic-Little, Brown; \$3.50).

HISTORICAL analogies admittedly are dangerous, but when, in the era of McCarran and McCarthy, a book appears which skillfully and competently analyzes the threat to our fledgling liberties in the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798, the temptation toward analogy is irresistible. Although Professor Miller has given us a work of historical scholarship rather than a political essay, he must have been aware of the peculiar timeliness of this fourth in the series of brilliant studies which have come from his pen. The historical record is all here, and from it Miller brings vividly and sometimes amusingly to life a large number of the cases which make up the story of this shameful period.

There are familiar features in this picture of a partisan clique augmenting and exploiting popular hysteria to gain a short-run political advantage at the expense of fundamental liberties. Miller may be a little over-hard on the Federalists, but with the central theme of the book and with its contemporary relevance there can be no argument. Changing a few proper nouns removes all that is not of 1952 from the passage: "If the Federalists seemed to be putting the cart before the horse in enacting the Sedition Act before war with France had been declared, it was perhaps because they were more interested in whipping the horse than in making the cart go." There is an unhappy parallel to the present in the myopia of the Federalist press, which feared its political opponents more than those among its allies who, in encouraging the suppression of dissenters, were threatening all freedom to print. Finally, there is familiarity in the demand for convictions which followed the enactment of the Sedition Act. Persuade a public that the land swarms with enemies who can be dealt with only through drastic legislation, and you create an insistent demand that "enemies" be brought to justice whether they exist or not.

Before drawing comfort from contemplating the failure of the Alien and

Sedition Acts, one must take notice of some of the more obvious weaknesses in the analogy. The collapse of the Federalist threat to freedom came less from the efforts of Americans to submerge their differences in defense of fundamental agreements than from actions in the outside world. Talleyrand's tactics did more to end the American crisis than did events here. Moreover, this political hysteria ran its course at a time when the United States was merely on the periphery of world politics. American abdication from a position of moral leadership had minor implications in a world in which power was lodged elsewhere.

DAVID B. TRUMAN

David B. Truman is professor of Government at Columbia University and the author, among other books, of The Governmental Process.

HANDBOOKS FOR CRISIS

NEGOTIATING WITH THE RUSSIANS.

Edited by Raymond Dennett and Joseph E. Johnson (World Peace Foundation; \$3.50).

THE ONLY WAR WE SEEK, by Arthur Goodfriend (ADA: Farrar, Straus & Young; \$3).

THE FIRST of these books is by eleven men who actually negotiated, during the years 1942-47, on such diverse problems as Lend-Lease, War Crimes Trials, control of the Balkans, and atomic energy. Though they stick to facts and to specific analyses of negotiating techniques, one feels that many of them, little known to the public, have better perspectives on broad strategy than is reflected by current official policy.

The key points which emerge from their reports are that the Soviet suffers from deep-seated suspicion of the Western nations (whose intervention after World War I gave the Soviet traumatic proof of capitalism's mortal enmity) and that we have been unable to create a bold, imaginative, far-reaching policy to cut through this rigid, fanatical suspicion. Under these conditions it would seem essential for our policy-makers to put themselves in the other fellow's place and recognize the myths whereby he lives. The record indicates that this has been done only on the most superficial level. For example, Frederick Osborn

apparently believes to this day that the atomic-weapons-control proposal was well-nigh perfect, certainly adequate to overcome Soviet suspicions, even though non-atomic weapons were not included and there were many ill-defined elements in the plan.

This record shows that in international negotiations, niceties aside, the major powers *all* insist on gaining their national ends, and yield points only to gain others, or because they have no choice. But Soviet negotiators are more strictly bound by instructions, more obvious in their tactics and in their resort to innuendo, propaganda, outright lies, verbose reiteration and sudden reversals; their government can refuse to fulfill a commitment without having to justify itself to a relatively well-informed public. Given the present nation-state world structure and the dearth of Christian practice, magnanimity can hardly be expected. But one may still hope for policies motivated by profounder, more far-sighted self-interest. The combination of international events, technological advances increasing the destructiveness of war, and *unified* internal pressure (by the many groups in this country now futilely seeking to influence official policy by independent action) may hasten the day when the United States will take a position for peace so unequivocally stated, so tenaciously applied, as to convince the Kremlin, the Russian people and the world that we truly seek it.

However, the chances are that only lessons of practical technique offered in this book will be heeded by our officialdom. In their limited sphere they are valuable: secret negotiations, minus daily press releases, help to prevent the negotiations from turning into propaganda battles; alertness and explicitness are essential to avoid semantic entanglements; straightforwardness combined with firmness is more effective than a resort to Soviet deviousness.

The Only War We Seek is an effective, ADA-sponsored, picture-text primer on that stepchild of our foreign policy, Point Four. With emphasis on China, this book drives home the lesson that inadequate, inept Point Four aid, combined with support of reactionary, auto-

cratic regimes, leads to totalitarian Communist victory. The pictures vividly contrast American luxury with world hunger and disease, and focus attention on the potentials of the underdeveloped countries which we could help them exploit for their benefit at relatively small cost to us. The device of examining American and Communist policies and actions through the average "customer's" eyes shows concretely why our methods did not win us friends in China and why all-out support of reform and democratic revolution is essential in the East.

ALEXANDER KLEIN

QUEST FOR GENIUS

FIFTY YEARS OF AMERICAN DRAMA: 1900-1950, by Alan S. Downer (\$2.50); THE MODERN NOVEL IN AMERICA: 1900-1950, by Frederick J. Hoffman (\$3); ACHIEVEMENT IN AMERICAN POETRY: 1900-1950, by Louise Bogan (\$2.50). Regnery.

EZRA POUND once wrote that a classic becomes such by virtue of a certain eternal and irrepressible freshness. The definition is disquietingly simple, almost too simple, and for a moment we suspect it might prove naïve. Yet Pound is right. A classic is something we come back to: a wellspring. Our momentary balking at his phrase stems from exposure to the criticism of this age which defines its classics by *formal* qualities: ambiguity, irony, symbolic action, intensity. Freshness, however, is the irreducible attribute, and the ability of critics like Eliot, Fergusson, Warren and Blackmur to release it from the fortified veneration surrounding masterpieces is their special excellence.

Here we are confronted with three books dealing "in historical as well as critical terms" with the past fifty years in American poetry, drama and the novel; three authors in effect sifting a half-century for its yield of potential classics—and for the most part the sense of freshness is strangely lacking (Miss Bogan's book being the exception). Is it the fault of the period that no works were produced to evoke this sense? Or is there some deficiency in evaluations that find so little vitality in fifty years of effort and achievement?

In attempting to answer this, one notes first off that a classic is a compound of both time and quality. Proclaiming a contemporary classic is always rather presumptuous, like the famed Vermont roadside sign, "Antiques Made to Order." Still, for Pound (and again I think his literary judgment stands up), a classic had certain recognizable features which could be checked against the literary landmarks of the past. This would seem the chief defect of this triple summing-up: the half-century is not evaluated against comparable periods of activity, and there is scant attempt to test its most significant works against the indispensable touchstones. As a result they ultimately appear neither big nor small, neither vital nor truly defined, even in relation to one another.

Alan S. Downer's basic criterion for his material is the most explicit of the three, and it is beyond reproach. He looks for a thoroughly organic and functional use of dramatic resources in each play, rather than any decorative use of staging, plotting or dialogue. In view of this, it is regrettable that he does not supplement his canon with greater critical imagination. He might thus have pared his excessive coverage of the florid theatre and soap-opera plots of Clyde Fitch and Belasco to the admitted neglect of "many works of . . . aesthetic value." Such disproportion has no place in a discussion of creative American drama. A vigorous critical imagination also would have blue-penciled pseudo-insights such as "O'Neill seems to visualize the process of living as a stream of consciousness in which the lifeline is always becoming fouled."

Frederick J. Hoffman analyzes the twentieth-century novel in terms of a schism between the protagonists of style, technique, craft (James, Wharton, Hemingway, Fitzgerald, *et al.*) and the naturalists and social realists (Dreiser, Norris, Anderson, Farrell, *et al.*) who demanded "human nature muscular, glandular, and undressed." The division is fruitful, and it still holds. Hoffman does creditably in sketching the contribution of each novelist, though the reiterated pattern that states each book's plot, accomplishment and limitations ultimately removes the reader from both

the sources of literary art and the fierce issues that engage it. Only with a few figures like Dreiser and Hemingway does Hoffman approach an interpretive richness. The rest often suggests a sequence of expanded footnotes.

I found Louise Bogan's study of contemporary poetry the most satisfying, a nicely drawn history—perhaps because she possesses the poet's twin abilities to condense and to imply. At least here I felt less as if I were glimpsing a colorful, populous city from the windows of a speeding taxi. Her judgments are polished and firm, though the reasoning behind them is seldom made explicit. Perhaps she felt the need was obviated by the concluding anthology of representative modern poems. If so, it was a happy appeal to the reader's intelligence, although in their short space the examples sometimes appear as unrepresentative as they are unhackneyed.

I have treated these studies largely as critical ventures because this seemed their primary responsibility to such recent and fluid material. As historical texts they are helpful but inadequate; as short surveys they are good reading, mostly focused upon the serious figures, yet in the final analysis, inconsequential. The point remains that the mid-century inquiry into and summation of a new classic American literature, even the account of the enormous coming-of-age implicit here, did not emerge. A well-timed and useful celebration has been mysteriously waylaid, scaled down to a simple celebration—one rather too pious and certainly too brief. ROLF FJELDE

FICTION PARADE

THE BIG BROKERS, by Irving Shulman (Dial; \$3.50).

LOVE IN A DRY SEASON, by Shelby Foote (Dial; \$3).

DEAD MEN RISING, by Seaforth Mackenzie (Harper; \$3).

THE MOST interesting question about Irving Shulman's account of the rise and fall of a group of Brooklyn gangsters (two earlier volumes of what may be considered a trilogy were *The Amboy Dukes* and *Cry Tough*) is why it isn't a good novel. He writes with verve and feeling about what is very probably the most vital subject available to an American novelist today—moral corruption; he is skilled at manipulating a large group of recognizable characters so that the reader is

neither confused nor reluctant to follow them to their separate ugly destinies, and he has a keen ear for tough talk.

And yet *The Big Brokers* is hardly worth consideration as a serious novel. Aside from the boner of placing his climactic scenes in a crowded grand-jury courtroom (a contradiction in terms), and a tendency to go on with his story beyond the point of human endurance, what is fatal to the author's scheme is his inability to establish any genuine moral distance between himself and the figures whom he describes as doomed and pitiable. He tells us that they are, but so do the makers of routine gangster pictures, and our involvement with the big brokers goes no deeper than our temporary concern for the fate of movie gangsters. Crime pictures of the caliber of *The Asphalt Jungle* appear only rarely, and Irving Shulman's new book is further evidence that their fictional counterparts have not yet even begun to appear.

The quality of cheapness, of novelistic opportunities casually kicked aside in favor of an easy sensationalism, is also apparent in Shelby Foote's new novel. Here again is a writer of more than ordinary skill tossing off a story of corruption and violence with no regard for anything more than surface effect.

Harley Drew, born Charles Drubashevski, ruthless son of a Youngstown steelworker (a stock second-generation type—compare the leading man of Willard Motley's recent *We Fished All Night*), goes South to seek his fortune and becomes involved with the promiscuous wife of a wealthy and blind young man. Since the husband had been a voyeur prior to the loss of his sight, his cuckoldom is peculiarly complicated and results in several scenes that should be skipped by people with weak stomachs. Readers who are curious to see how this sort of thing can be done gayly and without vulgarity would do better to consult Vladimir Nabokov's shocker, *Invitation to a Beheading*.

It is a relief to turn to a badly constructed but honestly conceived novel of garrison life in a Japanese prisoner-of-war camp, by a new Australian writer, Seaforth Mackenzie. For while the book is not successful either in its description of the tortured love life of Corporal John Sargent or in its slow buildup of the counterpointed prisoners' escape and slaughter, it is an admirable attempt to probe beneath the customary glib statements of war novelists about love and hate and fear and boredom.

Dead Men Rising, in other words, is deeply concerned with those basic human feelings that make novels worth reading and writing. Which is why Mackenzie's next novel will be awaited much more eagerly than those of Irving Shulman or Shelby Foote.

HARVEY SWADOS

CHURCH & STATE

A Special Issue of CONGRESS WEEKLY

a publication of

THE AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS

appears March 3

CONTENTS

Church & State Today
By Phil Baum

Dangers of Religious Divisions
By Milton R. Konvitz

Religion in the School
By V. T. Thayer

The Attack on Public Education
By Justine Wise Polier

Sunday Laws Are Religious Laws
By Frank H. Yost

Current Threats to Separation
By Joseph M. Dawson

Victims of Sectarian Conflict
By Leo Pfeffer

Is the Public School Godless?
By Conrad Moehlman

• • •

And reviews by Guy Emery
Shippler, Glen L. Archer
and Jerome Nathanson

• • •

Single Copies, 15 cents
Orders in Bulk, 10 cents
Subscription—\$3.00

CONGRESS WEEKLY
15 East 84th Street
New York 28, N. Y.

ON THE AIR

People Are Entertainment

SAM LEVENSON, a school teacher turned chronicler, is back on the air and may be seen Sundays at 6:30 over CBS-TV. During the greater part of his half-hour he just stands there and talks. For a few minutes, he brings on a couple of foils—the other night his guests were a high-school student and a teacher who supposedly discussed the effects of television on a person who is trying to get a formal education, and a landlady and her tenant who argued about services rendered. Once in the 30 minutes Levenson stepped out of camera range and let a group of acrobatic tumblers take over for a change of pace, but while the interviewees were on stage, he did most of the talking.

Sure of his material, firm and gentle in its presentation, Levenson draws primarily on the history of his own family, a voluminous brood that once inhabited a Brooklyn tenement. He tells of the crowding, the poverty, the privations. He is a comedian, but he never tries to pretend that there is anything funny

about existence on a sub-subsistence level. What makes the listener chuckle is Levenson's appreciation of the clan's hardihood, its ability to survive in spite of life in a flat where six kids sleep in one room, where homework must be done in the kitchen, where windows are forever sealed because of a botchy painting job (though there is plenty of air in a flat where no door fits its frame).

Levenson is no buffoon standing before his betters, entertaining them with tales about the life of the underdog. The laughter is the kind that comes from people's ability to pull through disaster—like the merriment of the British during the blitz or the jokes bandied about in the French Resistance. With great skill, Levenson removes the bitterness; but the flavor of realism is there. Monologue is one of the oldest of the dramatic arts, but good practitioners are infrequent on the air. Herb Shriner comes to mind with his tales of Indiana, and Red Skelton, who, however, must pepper his felicitous talk with grimaces and belly flops. Levenson is sometimes too anxious to make sure his audience knows he is only joking about a past that's gone; in those moments he titters—reminding one, of all things, of Mrs. Roosevelt's nervous giggle. Levenson can now drop that artificial punctuation; five minutes with him, and you know he is kidding—on the level.

luscious passes at the ladies twice a week, Tuesdays and Thursdays, at the relaxed hour of 11:15 p.m. The trend is beginning to look like a new cycle on the air, but it doesn't worry me a bit. When my reviewer's chores are done at the set, I can still turn to FM radio, and listen to excellent music.

There has always been plenty of this commodity in the New York listening area—with WNYC, WQXR, WABF, and at certain periods WNEW. Now NBC's key station, WNBC, has added an all-night disk jockey to its staff, and the platters he spins are from the symphonic music rack. The trouble is that, if I stay up too late, I can't get up in time to catch NBC-TV's *Today*, which Dave Garroway brings to the air promptly at seven a.m. *Today* has improved since its inception a few weeks ago. The news coverage "in depth" that some of us asked for is still lacking. But a little order is coming into it, and Garroway as "master communicator" seems more at ease. We're still waiting for NBC-TV's promised *Tonight*, scheduled to run from midnight to two a.m. Then a reviewer will get no sleep at all—or he might just chuck the whole thing and try to make an honest living.

SAUL CARSON

PEP

Pamphlets

• Single copies of the broadsheets issued by Political and Economic Planning (London) may still be purchased from the New Republic for 25¢ cash postpaid. The most recent issues are:

- #330 Economics of Book Publishing
- #331 The Sterling Area—I
- #332 The Sterling Area—II
- #333 Land-Use Planning
- #334 The Control of Investment
- #335 The Gramophone Record
- #336 Fuel Prospects
- #337 Home Ownership

Price 25¢—Order from

THE NEW REPUBLIC

40 EAST 49 STREET
New York 17, N. Y.

Faye Emerson's plunging neckline has been zippered, and the nature of Dagmar's appeal is still under discussion. But radio now has its Marlene Dietrich program, reviewed here a few weeks ago, and Ilona Massey's gorgeous shoulders may be seen on television any Wednesday night at 9:30. Miss Dietrich makes her headquarters at *Café Istanbul*, Sunday's at 9:15, while Miss Massey's headquarters are in Paris, at the *Café Nikki*. Both programs are ABC products and both packages are wrapped in the same tinsel. The ladies chant sultry tunes, love freely and with abandon, run bistros and pursue spies for the fun of it. *Lonesome Gal*, who used to pitch woo over Mutual, is off the air now—in the East anyway. But CBS-TV has *The Continental* making

THEATRE

Something of England

IF I HAD to describe in a word the evening of readings from Charles Dickens given by Emlyn Williams I would say that it was agreeable. The quality is not tame; the kind of agreeableness achieved is of that peculiarly English brand which produces a sort of benign, almost enchanted quiet, rest and smiling security. (I could not help remembering, as I sat listening to Williams, that I had experienced something of the same pleasure as a boy, when my father read to me from his favorite authors whenever I grew restless through the confinement of a winter day.) We are all kids as we listen to Williams. Remarks in praise of the actor's shrewd virtuosity are ultimately

of secondary consideration; the fact is this evening of Dickens remains child-like and pure.

Dickens himself is not so innocent. He is more or less a radical. The mordancy of his observation of middle-class English life is to be seen even in the fragments of Williams' program. Yet hardly any of the sharpness is communicated—only the charm. This too is characteristic of the English. Their good manners often make even the bitter sound fetching.

Decorum leads to decoration. The motifs of decoration may be similar to those of tragic art. A thorn in decoration loses its sting; a dagger may become as pretty as a flower. There is something of this transformation in Christopher Fry's work. Its material is often brackish, but the manner is always sweet. If one listens closely to *Venus Observed*, for example, one hears some fairly gloomy sentiments, but the total impression is always agreeable—almost delicious.

"The note is loneliness," says the Duke in *Venus Observed*. "So much I delighted in is all ash," he continues. And further: "... I forgive/Both of us for being born of the flesh/Which means I forgive all tossing and turning /All foundering, all not finding/All irreconcilability/All the friction of this great orphanage/Where no one knows his origin and no one/Comes to claim him. I forgive even/The unrevealing revelation of love/That lifts a lid purely /To close it, and leaves us knowing that greater things/Are close, but not to be disclosed/Though we die for them."

All this, as far as sense goes, is in the existentialist vein. But Fry turns it into something elegant, witty, exquisitely sentimental. Better still is a certain gentle, almost tenderly humorous forbearance. Fry's mood is autumnal ("The landscape's all in tune, in a falling cadence/All decaying"). It is autumnal not only in this play, which is an allegory of the passing of old (aristocratic, imperial) England, but even in plays presumed to reflect the atmosphere of brighter seasons.

That is why Fry's plays, even when they contain "strong" action (a pistol shot, arson, a rescue from fire, threatened imprisonment) seem placid and passive. The best days are over; the struggles ahead, we know from the past, are not worth the burning. Let us embrace civilization and forget progress. Since it is their way, the young may toss and turn; the wise will contemplate the universe with an affectionate nod. It all comes to a snore in the end.

Let no one say that Fry's work consists of playful, euphonious words and no more. The meaning is clear to anyone who will pay attention. (The continuous verbal coruscation sometimes makes attention difficult, so that the line of the play—which is usually as pointed as a fable—is obscured.) And the meaning—no matter how one reacts to it—is historically (or socially) revealing. Fry's plays are poems of resignation in which tragic substance is flattened into lovely ornament. The French existentialists (most of whom are poor as creative artists) have a more vigorous intention and an activist temper. Fry confesses here through his leading character, who dwells in the high air observing the stars, "I like to conform."

The challenge of Fry's plays is seldom met by directors because they seem to appreciate him only in terms of quips and fine speeches, and not in terms of feeling, atmosphere, significance. *Venus Observed* is done as a romantic drawing-room comedy rendered limp by literature. Rex Harrison, who is an admirable light comedian—his delivery suggests intelligence—seems miscast in this play. His manner is brittle and worldly in a tripping sort of way, whereas Fry's Duke "dances" to a graciously regretful tune. Harrison stoops and fumbles to convey age: there is no sovereign tiredness or melancholy anywhere in him.

The rest of the cast is careful or valiant—smiling bravely through the hazard of words they have respectfully learned. John Williams, who plays a faltering representative of mercantile England, seems to be having fun—it helps us to enjoy his performance.

HAROLD CLURMAN

PRINTED BY NATIONAL PUBLISHING CO., 301 N ST., N.E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C.

FACTS ON FILE

The Only
Indexed Reference
to All the News in
Weekly Digest Form

THE FASTEST WAY TO FIND ANY
NEWS FACT, PAST OR PRESENT

• Gives you the facts—nothing but the facts—without slant or bias... facts about everything and everybody of importance in every major news field. Gives you instant reference to any news subject, past or present, through unique cumulative index.

• Every week you get the **FACTS ON FILE News Digest**... 1,000,000 words condensed to 10,000—100 hours of reading reduced to 30-35 minutes!

• And, week by week, FOF grows into a fully indexed encyclopedia of world events—a compact, indispensable reference file. Widely used in business, libraries, embassies, editorial offices, radio stations—by informed individuals in business, professional life, government service, etc.

SPECIAL TRIAL OFFER

3 months of **FACTS ON FILE Weekly News Digest with Index Service** for only \$6.00 (regular yearly rate is \$55.00). Return this ad with \$6.00—or we will bill you later if you prefer.

FACTS ON FILE, Inc.

Dept. 19-3

516 Fifth Ave., New York 36, N. Y.

MANUMIT SCHOOL

• Boys and girls 6-18 develop individuality in free creative atmosphere. intercultural. College preparatory. Dramatics, art, music, sciences, mathematics. 80-acre farm in Bucks County between New York and Philadelphia. Friendly, informal, homelike. Healthful outdoor life. Horses. Summer camp. Catalog.

W. M. and B. G. C. FINCKE, Co-Directors,
Box R, R. F. D. No. 2, Bristol, Pennsylvania

BOOKS

ATHEIST BOOKS, 32-page catalogue free. Truth Seeker Co., 38 Park Row, N. Y. C. 8.

LITERARY SERVICES

AUTHORS! Sales department available for your short stories, articles, books and plays. Free booklet. Write to-day! Mead Literary Agency, 419 4th Ave., New York 16, N. Y. (Or. 9-1150).

ORGANIZATION

CAN THE PROBLEM OF EVIL BE SOLVED? World group proposes people's united religious and nonreligious moral-economic movement for peace and for equality. You are needed. Pamphlet "R" free. No obligation. Write today. The World Associates, Box 5582, Friendship Station, Washington 16, D. C.

PERSONAL

exit loneliness

Somewhere there is someone you would like to know. Somewhere there is someone who would like to know you. We can help you find a richer, happier life through discreet, dignified "social introductions." Write for booklet, or phone
MAY RICHARDSON
Dept. N.R., 111 West 72 Street
New York City EN 2-2033



A Group of General Essays

Commencing in the forthcoming issue—March 10—there will appear in the *New Republic* a group of essays by distinguished writers on subjects that seem to the editors to warrant general review. The titles and brief descriptions that follow will indicate the scope of the project.

1. WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO MARXISM?

by G. D. H. COLE

An analysis of the Marxist doctrines, showing how the underlying economic and political principles have been modified and adapted by various countries living under different conditions.

2. THE INDISPOSED BILL OF RIGHTS

by GERALD W. JOHNSON

A point-by-point investigation into the vitality and current moral authority of the ten Articles upon which the American citizen depends for his freedom and by which he should be guided in his dealings with others.

3. COMMUNICATION IN MODERN POETRY

by DUDLEY FITTS

To whom are our poets speaking, what is it they are trying to say and why do they choose language that is often obscure, sometimes bizarre, and frequently unintelligible to the average reader?

4. THE EVOLUTION OF AMERICAN HUMOR

by C. HARTLEY GRATTAN

An inquiry into the development and present quality of the American gift for humor, a characteristic widely considered one of the great sources of our strength.

If not a subscriber, subscribe.

If a subscriber, renew now.

Armed Service Order Form

THE NEW REPUBLIC

40 East 49 Street • New York 17, N. Y.

For the enclosed \$4.00 please enter an annual subscription in my name at the special Armed Service rate of \$4.00 (Open to active members of the Services at APO or military addresses.)

NAME

ADDRESS

IN FULL

3/3/52

Regular Order Form

THE NEW REPUBLIC

40 East 49 Street • New York 17, N. Y.

For the enclosed \$6.50 please enter an annual subscription in my name. (Foreign or Canadian postage \$1.00 extra.)

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE 3/3/52

Johnson City, Tennessee